

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, 16-18, and 20-30 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 20-28, and 30 are amended. Claims 16-18 are canceled. Claims 31-33 are added. Claims 1, 4-9, and 20-33 are pending upon entry of this amendment. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below.

Response to Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-9, 16-18 and 20-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,058,417 to Hess et al. ("Hess") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,982,369 to Sciammarella et al. ("Sciammarella") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,076,443 to Emens et al. ("Emens"). This rejection is now traversed in view of the above amendment.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to now recite the following:

A method for generating search results for display in response to a search query, comprising:

obtaining a user generated product search query for relevant products, together with a first user selection of a selected output format from a plurality of output formats and a second user selection of a selected cue from a plurality of cues;

performing the product search query for relevant products, the performing being done in response to obtaining the product search query, the first user selection, and the second user selection;

obtaining search results that reference a set of products determined to be responsive to the product search query, the set of products being associated with the plurality of cues; and

outputting instructions for displaying the selected cue of the set of products on a search result page in an order corresponding to a relevance ranking and in the selected output format according to the first user selection and the second user selection, wherein the plurality of output formats includes a grid view and a list view, wherein the grid view is comprised of a plurality of cells, and each cell displaying information corresponding to the selected

cue of one product.

Support for the claim amendments is found in the specification as filed at, for example, paragraph [0008] on page 4, and paragraphs [0026-27] on pages 8-9.

The applied references, Hess, Sciammarella, and Emens, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Hess, among other differences, does not disclose the following claim 1 limitations: (1) “performing the product search query for relevant products, the performing being done in response to obtaining the product search query, the first user selection, and the second user selection”, and (2) “outputting instructions for displaying the selected cue of the set of products on a search result page in an order corresponding to a relevance ranking and in the selected output format according to the first user selection and the second user selection”.

Hess, in contrast, discloses a system for displaying auditing items in a list view or in a gallery view. See Hess, col. 5, lines 3-24 (5:3-24), and Figures 1 and 9A. A user can switch between the two views by clicking a text mode button and a photo mode button displayed on the search result page. See Hess at 9:49-53 and Figure 9A. Unlike the above-cited claim limitation (1), the Hess system does not perform a query in response to obtaining user selections of an output format and a cue. In Hess, a user can only select a display view after the query result is generated and displayed (i.e., by clicking buttons on the search result display page). Also, in Hess a user cannot specify what cue of auction items to be displayed in the display page. The user can only select an output format (i.e., a list view or a gallery view) in Hess, and cannot select what cue of the matching auction items to be displayed in the output format. Thus, the Hess reference also does not disclose outputting instructions for

displaying the user selected cue of matching products in the search result page as recited in claim limitation (2).

Sciammarella and Emens similarly fail to disclose the claim limitation not taught by Hess. Sciammarella teaches a method of displaying image search results. See Sciammarella, Abstract. The sizes of the images in the search result correspond to the images' match values (i.e., an image corresponding to a high match value is displayed in a large size). Emens teaches associating related advertisements with search result items. See Emens, Abstract. Neither of Sciammarella and Emens is related to claim limitations (1) and (2).

In view of the above, Hess, Sciammarella, and Emens, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Independent claims 20 and 23, and the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicants have added new claims 31-33 for which Applicants request consideration and examination. Applicants respectfully submit that these are supported by the specification and are commensurate within the scope of protection to which Applicants believe they are entitled.

In conclusion, Applicants submit that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited reference and request that the application be allowed. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

Dated: November 5, 2009

Respectfully Submitted,

/Jie Zhang/

Jie Zhang, Reg. No. 60,242
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7297
Fax: (650) 938-5200